

Modelling Time

B.G. Sidharth

International Institute for Applicable Mathematics & Information Sciences
Hyderabad (India) & Udine (Italy)

B.M. Birla Science Centre, Adarsh Nagar, Hyderabad - 500 063 (India)

Abstract

We briefly review two concepts of time - the usual time associated with "being" and more recent ideas, answering to the description of "becoming". The approximation involved in the former is examined. Finally we argue that it is (unpredictable) fluctuations that underlie time.

Keywords: Time, irreversible, statistical, fluctuations.

1 Introduction

Twentieth century physics inherited the Newtonian concept of space and time. Even with the advent of Special Relativity some of these ideas remained though time became less absolute and the concept of simultaneity got modified. In particular time was reversible. With the advent of Quantum Mechanics, there was a carry over of these concepts, even though there were new inputs like the effect of observation. So the description is that of a time reversible universe, in contrast to real life experience. It may be mentioned however that all this is strictly speaking valid for a single particle universe or at best an isolated system of a few particles. In statistical mechanics we encounter a different scenario where time is irreversible. Indeed the arrow of time is associated with an increase of entropy.

All this can be brought out by the simple example of a container with two

compartments. Compartment A is filled with a swarm of molecules. In contrast compartment B is empty. A tiny hole is then bored into the dividing wall. Molecules from A gradually leak into compartment B , till both compartments have more or less an equal number of molecules. Molecules would still be crossing over from A to B and vice versa, but this state of equilibrium persists. Here with the passage of time the empty compartment B has got filled up with molecules. There is however no reversibility as in classical and Quantum Theory in the sense that we do not get back a situation, even in principle where the compartment B gets emptied out and all the molecules in B fill up compartment A .

There have been a number of arguments for and against the arrow of time in the context of modern theories of physics [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Nevertheless the fact that there should not be an arrow of time even within the context of Quantum Theory has been discussed [1]. Indeed as Penrose prophesized, [6] "the tiny fact of an almost completely hidden time-asymmetry seems genuinely to be present in the K^0 -decay. It is hard to believe that nature is not, so to speak, trying to tell something through the results of this delicate and beautiful experiment." It may be observed that the time symmetries actually encountered are:

- i) The thermodynamic arrow of time, which represents an evolution towards a greater entropy.
- ii) The electromagnetic arrow of time, which becomes apparent in the retarded nature of electromagnetic radiation chosen due to considerations of causality.
- iii) The CP violating arrow of time.
- iv) The cosmological arrow of time which appears in the expansion of the universe or the formation of structures.

These arrows are generally sought to be explained in terms of the usual time symmetric dynamics, but with the additional input of time asymmetric boundary conditions, for instance in the above example of a container A with molecules being in contact with an empty container B , we start *ab initio* with an asymmetric situation. The initial asymmetry in the universe is provided by the Big Bang, as another example [7, 8]. This is also the content of the Ehrenfest's so called double urn model [9]—it is essentially the above two compartment argument. In any case this is how an asymmetric outcome is understood to arise from symmetric considerations—the arrow of time from time reversible laws. Other models have not lead to anything conclusive, for example with the rather abstract arguments of Finkelstein [10].

2 Prigogine's Analysis

Prigogine had analyzed the above situation quite clearly. He observed [11] that according to the classical point of view, nature would be an automaton. However, today we discover everywhere instabilities, bifurcations, evolution. This demands a different formulation of the laws of nature to include probability and time symmetry breaking. He argued that the difficulties in the classical formulation come from too narrow a point of view concerning the fundamental laws of dynamics (classical or quantum). The classical model has been a model of integrable systems (in the sense of Poincare). It is this circumstance that leads to determinism and time reversibility. He argued that when we leave this model and consider a class of non-integrable systems, the difficulties are overcome. Further, this approach unifies dynamics, thermodynamics and probability theory.

The point is that in classical theory we use unitary transformations (Cf.ref.[11, 12]) to introduce new momenta and coordinates related to the old p and q by $p' = U^{-1}p$, $q' = U^{-1}q$, where U is a so-called unitary operator. These transformations are made in such a way that the Hamiltonian equations remain valid. U plays an essential role both in classical and quantum mechanics. An important property is the distributivity of U . That means that U acting on a product is equal to the product of the individual transformations. That is, $U^{-1}(AB) = (U^{-1}A)(U^{-1}B)$. The above formulation of classical mechanics and integrable systems is taken over into Quantum Mechanics though we no longer use numbers p and q but rather operators. The important point however is that Quantum Mechanics too uses integrable systems.

Prigogine goes on to point out that integrable systems are the exception, rather than being the rule. Let us consider a simple example of a non integrable system viz., a Harmonic oscillator in for example an electromagnetic field. If the frequency of the Harmonic oscillator ω is outside of the spectrum of the frequencies ω' of the field then there is no new situation. When however the oscillator frequency falls within the frequency spectrum of the field, then we have to deal with divergent terms like $1/(\omega - \omega')$. This leads to the well known Poincare resonances.

We could still continue with a transformation like the unitary transformation U , except that it gets replaced by a transformation Λ which is not unitary but rather is called star unitary. There is now an extension of canonical transformations and the old theory no longer applies. The operator Λ becomes non local. As Prigogine observes, "...classically people were thinking

in terms of points but here we have to speak in terms of ensembles. We cannot any more make a physics of points but we have to make a physics of distributions. This means that we have a statistical description. That also means that we have to give up classical determinism.” Other new elements are also introduced into the theory.

It must be mentioned that even in Quantum Theory, be it the Schrodinger equation or the Dirac equation, the wave function still follows a deterministic theory as in classical mechanics. The indeterminism of Quantum Mechanics comes in through a different mechanism, that is an observation disturbs the system and there is at that very instant a non causal collapse of the wave function into one of its eigen states. Interestingly it has been shown [13, 14] that from the new non unitary transformations one can derive the Langevin equations and this leads to a contact with statistical mechanics. It is also possible to obtain the Quantum Langevin equation.

3 Microscopic Considerations

In the preceding section, the analysis was based on notions of macroscopic mechanics. However Salecker and Wigner [15, 16] argued that the macroscopic concepts of space and time have no operational meaning for micro systems. That is spacetime descriptions may be valid only for macroscopic systems. To quote Wigner, ”... the inherent limitations on the accuracy of a clock of given weight and size, which should run for a period of a certain length, are quite severe. In fact, the result in summary is that a clock is an essentially non-microscopic object. In particular, what we vaguely call an atomic clock, a single atom which ticks off its periods, is surely an idealization which is in conflict with fundamental concepts of measurability.”

Zimmerman and others [17, 18] suggested that space and time arise from the properties of microscopic particles in a thermodynamic fashion in the sense that the former are a result of interactions among many microscopic systems, without a detailed description of the interactions amongst these systems in spatio-temporal terms.

In this context there have been more recent efforts in Quantum Gravity approaches. While some resemble Hawking’s Euclidean Quantum Gravity in that the super position principle is applied for the several possible ways the entire universe could evolve in time (Cf.refs.[19] for a readable account), a more recent variant approach has been that of causal dynamical triangula-

tion of Loll, Ambjorn and others. Here in the spirit of the usual triangulation, spacetime develops from the micro level in a self organizational scheme [20, 21, 22]. It must be mentioned that these recent approaches are based on three pillars which are, discreteness rather than continuum, emergence (as opposed to a reductionist approach) and causality. While this is reasonable from a physical point of view, particularly the requirement of causality does not go far enough. It already hides an implicit arrow of time. In any case these approaches cannot as yet be termed as being successful or the last word [23].

In this spirit the author has argued (Cf.[24] and several references therein) that physical concepts of space and time or spacetime arise outside the Compton wavelength within which these concepts no longer hold [25]. Indeed this is already implicit in Wigner's analysis referred to. Within the Compton wavelength, we have unphysical phenomena like Zitterbewegung and a breakdown of causality- only an average over the Compton scale restores physics (Cf. also [24, 26]). Within the Compton scale time can be modelled by a double Weiner process corresponding to a one dimensional Random Walk. It must be reiterated that within the Compton wavelength there is no causal physics [27]. Indeed it can be argued that Special Relativity becomes operational outside the Compton wavelength (Cf.ref.[25]). In this sense we are justified in considering time, rather than spacetime. We will return to this shortly. To appreciate all this let us consider the motion of a particle with position given by $x(t)$, subject to random correction given by, as in the usual theory, (Cf.[28, 29, 30]),

$$|\Delta x| = \sqrt{\langle \Delta x^2 \rangle} \approx \nu \sqrt{\Delta t},$$

$$\nu = \hbar/m, \nu \approx lv \tag{1}$$

where ν is the so called diffusion constant and is related to the mean free path l as above. We can then proceed to deduce the Fokker-Planck equation as follows (Cf.ref.[28] for details):

We first define the forward and backward velocities corresponding to having time going forward and backward (or positive or negative time increments) in the usual manner,

$$\frac{d_+}{dt}x(t) = \mathbf{b}_+, \frac{d_-}{dt}x(t) = \mathbf{b}_- \tag{2}$$

This leads to the Fokker-Planck equations

$$\partial \rho / \partial t + \text{div}(\rho \mathbf{b}_+) = V \Delta \rho,$$

$$\partial\rho/\partial t + \text{div}(\rho\mathbf{b}_-) = -U\Delta\rho \quad (3)$$

defining

$$V = \frac{\mathbf{b}_+ + \mathbf{b}_-}{2} \quad ; U = \frac{\mathbf{b}_+ - \mathbf{b}_-}{2} \quad (4)$$

We get on addition and subtraction of the equations in (3) the equations

$$\partial\rho/\partial t + \text{div}(\rho V) = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$U = \nu\nabla\ln\rho \quad (6)$$

It must be mentioned that V and U are the statistical averages of the respective velocities. We can then introduce the definitions

$$V = 2\nu\nabla S \quad (7)$$

$$V - \imath U = -2\imath\nu\nabla(\ln\psi) \quad (8)$$

We next observe the decomposition of the Schrodinger wave function as

$$\psi = \sqrt{\rho}e^{\imath S/\hbar}$$

leads to the well known Hamilton-Jacobi type equation

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{2m}(\partial S)^2 + \bar{\mathbf{V}} + Q, \quad (9)$$

where

$$Q = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}}$$

From (7) and (8) we can finally deduce the usual Schrodinger equation or (9) [31].

We note that in this formulation three conditions are assumed, conditions whose import has not been clear. These are [28]:

(1) The current velocity is irrotational. Thus, there exists a function $S(x, t)$ such that

$$m\vec{V} = \vec{\nabla} S$$

(2) In spite of the fact that the particle is subject to random alterations in its motion there exists a conserved energy, defined in terms of its probability distribution.

(3) The diffusion constant is inversely proportional to the inertial mass of

the particle, with the constant of proportionality being a universal constant $\hbar$ (Cf. equation (1)):

$$\nu = \frac{\hbar}{m}$$

We note that the complex feature above disappears if the fractal or non-differentiable character is not present, (that is, the forward and backward time derivatives(4) are equal): What distinguishes Quantum Mechanics is the adhoc feature, the diffusion constant ν of (1) in Nelson's theory and the "Quantum potential" Q of (9) which appears in Bohm's theory [32] as well, though with a different meaning.

Interestingly from the Uncertainty Principle,

$$m\Delta x \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t} \sim \hbar$$

we get back equation (1) of Brownian motion. This shows the close connection on the one hand, and provides, on the other hand, a rationale for the particular, otherwise adhoc identification of ν in (1) - its being proportional to $\hbar$.

We would like to emphasize that we have arrived at the Quantum Mechanical Schrodinger equation from Classical considerations of diffusion, though with some new assumptions. In the above, effectively we have introduced a complex velocity $V - \imath U$ which alternatively means that the real coordinate x goes into a complex coordinate

$$x \rightarrow x + \imath x' \tag{10}$$

To see this in detail, let us rewrite (4) as

$$\frac{dX_r}{dt} = V, \quad \frac{dX_\imath}{dt} = U, \tag{11}$$

where we have introduced a complex coordinate X with real and imaginary parts X_r and $X_\imath$, while at the same time using derivatives with respect to time as in conventional theory.

We can now see from (4) and (11) that

$$W = \frac{d}{dt}(X_r - \imath X_\imath) \tag{12}$$

That is, in this non relativistic development either we use forward and backward time derivatives and the usual space coordinate as in (4), or we use the

derivative with respect to the usual time coordinate but introduce complex space coordinates as in (10). Already, we can get a glimpse of the special relativistic hyperbolic geometry with real space and imaginary time coordinates (or vice versa).

We now try to generalize this complex coordinate to three dimensions. Then we encounter a surprise - we end up with not three, but four dimensions,

$$(1, \imath) \rightarrow (I, \sigma),$$

where I is the unit 2×2 matrix and σ s are the Pauli matrices. We get the special relativistic Lorentz invariant metric at the same time. (In this sense, as noted by Sachs [33], Hamilton who made this generalization would have hit upon Special Relativity, if he had identified the new fourth coordinate with time).

That is,

$$x + \imath y \rightarrow Ix_1 + \imath x_2 + jx_3 + kx_4,$$

where $(\imath, j, k)$ now represent the Pauli matrices; and, further,

$$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 - x_4^2$$

is invariant. Before proceeding further, we remark that special relativistic time emerges above from the generalization of the complex one dimensional space coordinate to three dimensions.

While the usual Minkowski four vector transforms as the basis of the four dimensional representation of the Poincare group, the two dimensional representation of the same group, given by the right hand side in terms of Pauli matrices, obeys the quaternionic algebra of the second rank spinors (Cf.Ref.[34, 35, 33] for details).

In the above context let us try to see what the time of the usual theory is: In the stochastic approach, we deal with a double Wiener process which leads to a complex velocity $V - \imath U$. As noted it is this complex velocity that leads to Quantum Theory from the usual diffusion theory.

To see this in a simple way, let us write the usual diffusion equation as

$$\Delta x \cdot \Delta x = \frac{h}{m} \Delta t \equiv \nu \Delta t \quad (13)$$

We saw that equation (13) can be rewritten as the usual Quantum Mechanical relation,

$$m \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t} \cdot \Delta x = h = \Delta p \cdot \Delta x \quad (14)$$

We are dealing here, with phenomena within the Compton or De Broglie wavelength.

We now treat the diffusion constant ν to be very small, but non vanishing. That is, we consider the semi classical case. This is because, a purely classical description, does not provide any insight.

It is well known that in this situation we can use the WKB approximation [36]. Whence the right hand side of the wave function,

$$\psi = \sqrt{\rho} e^{i/\hbar S}$$

goes over to, in the one dimensional case, for simplicity,

$$(p_x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{\hbar} \int p(x) dx}$$

so that we have, on comparison,

$$\rho = \frac{1}{p_x} \tag{15}$$

ρ being the probability density. In this case the condition $U \approx 0$, that is, the velocity potential becoming real, implies

$$\nu \cdot \nabla \ln(\sqrt{\rho}) \approx 0 \tag{16}$$

This semi classical analysis suggests that $\sqrt{\rho}$ is a slowly varying function of x , in fact each of the factors on the left side of (16) would be $\sim 0(\hbar)$, so that the left side is $\sim 0(\hbar^2)$ (which is being neglected). Then from (15) we conclude that p_x is independent of x , or is a slowly varying function of x . The equation of continuity now gives

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla}(\rho \vec{v}) = \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = 0$$

That is the probability density ρ is independent or nearly so, not only of x but also of t . We are thus in a stationary and homogenous scenario. This is strictly speaking, possible only in a single particle Universe, or for a completely isolated particle, without any effect of the environment. Under these circumstances we have the various conservation laws and the time reversible theory, all this taken over into Quantum Mechanics as well. This is an approximation valid for small, incremental changes, as indeed is implicit in the

concept of a differentiable spacetime manifold.

To put it simply, if dt is the change or time interval in the usual time, then N such intervals would imply a passage of time of magnitude Ndt , whereas in our approach, if $d\tau$ is the basic interval, then the time passage would be $\sqrt{N}d\tau$.

We recognize that time is statistical and depends on the number of constituents. There could be collisions amongst N particles, or equivalently, as we will see below the fluctuational creation of such particles from the background Dark Energy. It could then be possible to ascribe a general minimum time interval τ for all the N particles, which would be for example the mean free time between the collisions or the fluctuational creation of particles. On the other hand let τ_0 represent the corresponding quantity, but this time associated with each individual event rather than the entire assembly. We would then have (Cf. also ref.[18])

$$\tau = \lambda\tau_0, \quad (17)$$

where λ represents the statistical dispersion effect and is given by

$$\lambda = \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\theta_i)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \quad (18)$$

θ_i representing the coefficient to be multiplied into each individual τ_0 , in order to get the corresponding interval for the i th particle. As N is large and the θ_i are all of the order 1, using (18) in (17) we get

$$\tau = 1/\sqrt{N}\tau_0 \quad (19)$$

As there are N such events, the time elapsed T would be $N\tau$ which from (19) is given by

$$T = \sqrt{N}\tau_0 \quad (20)$$

The relevance of all this is the following. The author's 1997 model was one in which particles were fluctuationally created from a background Dark Energy within the Compton time τ_0 . It may be mentioned that this model lead to a cosmology in which the universe was accelerating with a small cosmological constant, besides many other consistent but otherwise inexplicable astrophysical relations being deduced from the theory (Cf.refs.[37, 32, 38, 24] and several references therein). As is known all this was confirmed in 1998

itself through the observations of distant supernovae. In this model given n particles at any time, $\sqrt{n}$ particles would be fluctuationally created in the time τ_0 . That is we would have,

$$\frac{dn}{dt} \approx \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\tau_0}$$

because the interval τ_0 being small, we can approximate with derivatives. Whence on integration from time $t = 0$ to $t = T$, we get,

$$T = \sqrt{N}\tau_0 \tag{21}$$

In (21), at time T there would be N particles in the universe. Not only is (21) consistent, because there are N of the order 10^{80} particles in the universe while T is of the order 10^{17} seconds and τ_0 a typical Compton time is of the order 10^{-23} seconds, but as can be seen (21) is identical to (20) though it is obtained by a different route. The above is very much in the spirit of a one dimensional Random Walk or two Weiner process encountered earlier. In this case time would flip forward and backward like steps to the right and steps to the left at random. The nett dispersion or time elapsed after N such stages would be exactly as in equations (20) or (21). In the above cosmological model this would mean that particles would be created and destroyed at random, from and into the background Dark Energy, but the nett result is given by (21). In this formulation, there is no inbuilt causality.

4 Remarks

Time is associated with change. In a changeless universe, there would be no time. It must be mentioned here that various theories of time, already imply time or more generally change (Cf. also [39]). The question is, what type of a change do we consider? We have argued that the time which we usually use is based on an incremental change - it is almost as if there were no change. For example the law of conservation of energy is based on a time translation symmetry - an infinitesimal translation in time leaves everything unchanged [40]. Clearly this is only an approximation which assumes that there is no change in a very short interval.

In fact time is essentially an ordering or sequencing of events. The key here is the way in which this ordering is done so that causality and other laws of

physics hold or emerge rather than being inputs. If we consider the universe as a sequence of instantaneous space slices, to start with, then a random sequence would represent a lawless, and literally chaotic universe.

On the contrary we have seen that at the micro scale, that is, more specifically within the Compton scale, indeed there is no causality and there is the chaotic Zitterbewegung. This means that if it were possible for a creature or a measuring device to be so small as to be within the Compton scale, then such a creature or device would perceive a lawless, chaotic universe. However physics, (and this includes elementary particles) emerges once averages over the unphysical Compton scale are taken. In this sense the universe that is perceived and measured is a macroscopic universe. At the micro level, as pointed out by Wigner and Sackler, we can no longer extrapolate these macro concepts. In a sense, this is connected with the Copenhagen debate on the role of macroscopic measuring devices in obtaining information about microscopic systems.

At the macro scale however we have two different situations. One, which we encountered in the first section can further be exemplified with the example of a porcelain plate that falls to the ground and breaks into many pieces. Here a highly ordered system, namely the porcelain plate becomes a highly disordered system, namely the collection of shattered pieces. As long as we do not specify the exact shapes and sizes of the shattered pieces in advance, this can always happen - it provides an arrow of time with increasing entropy. This time, furthermore is irreversible. The shattered pieces then combining to form the plate or equivalently the shattered pieces, which describe a very definite prescribed shape and size would be an impossibility and would represent the reversal of time. In any case, the connection between time and probability is brought about. If the probability of something happening is (in advance) zero or nearly so, time does not "evolve" to such a situation. Time's arrow or flow is in the direction of non vanishing probabilities.

There is another change that we had considered in the previous section - this is the fluctuational creation of particles. This gives rise to a macroscopic time, through a Brownian process, leading to the correct age of the universe as exemplified in (21). In contrast to the change which our usual time represents, this latter Brownian change is no longer incremental. This picture is a far cry from the smoothly flowing time of usual theory. The contrast is between "becoming" and "being". Moreover, this time is based on, not just the local particle, but a whole assembly of particles, as brought out by (18), for example. Our contention is that it is this irreversible change of fluctua-

tions that represents our actual time. This is in the spirit of Bergson's future being creation [41].

In any case, the above discussion shows the breakdown of the concept of point time or instants of time. Indeed as Wigner (loc.cit) notes, this concept has no meaning at least within the time interval thrown up by the Uncertainty Principle, and perhaps even beyond. Finally, it may be mentioned that the probabilistic feature of time discussed above, brings in to play via observer participation, two poorly understood concepts as of now: information and consciousness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to the editor for the pertinent and valuable comments in the light of which the paper has been revised.

References

- [1] Sidharth, B.G. (2000). *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals* 11, pp. 1045-1046.
- [2] Coveney, P.V. (1988). *Nature* Vol.333, pp.409-415.
- [3] Ranada F. Antonio, Tiemblo, A. (2008). *Found.Phys* 38; pp.458-469.
- [4] Gell'man, M. and Hartle, J.B. (1996). *Time Symmetry and Asymmetry in Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Cosmology in Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry* (Eds.) Halliwell, J.J., Perez-Mercader, J. and Zurek, W.H. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [5] Lebowitz, J.L. (1996). *Times Arrow and Boltzmann Entropy in Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry* (Eds.) Halliwell, J.J., Perez-Mercader, J. and Zurek, W.H. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [6] Hawking, S., Israel, W. (1979). *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [7] Hu, B.L. (1996). *Fluctuation, Dissipation and Irreversibility in Cosmology in Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry* (Eds.) Halliwell, J.J., Perez-Mercader, J. and Zurek, W.H. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).

- [8] Hawking, S.W. (1996). *The No Boundary Condition and the Arrow of Time* in *Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry* (Eds.) Halliwell, J.J., Perez-Mercader, J. and Zurek, W.H. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [9] Wheeler, J.A. (1996). *Time Today in Physical Origin* in *Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry* (Eds.) Halliwell, J.J., Perez-Mercader, J. and Zurek, W.H. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [10] Finkelstein, D. (1972). *Phys.Rev.D* Volume 5, No.12, 15 June 1972, pp.2922ff.
- [11] Prigogine, I. (2008) in *A Century of Ideas* (Ed.) Sidharth, B.G. (Springer, Netherlands).
- [12] Goldstein, H. (1966). *Classical Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.), pp.76ff.
- [13] Prigogine, I., Kim, S., Ordonez, G. and Petrosky, T. (2001). *Stochasticity and time symmetry breaking in Hamiltonian dynamics* submitted to Proc. Solvay conference in Delphi, Greece.
- [14] Ordonez, G., Petrosky, T., and Prigogine, I. (2001) *Microscopic entropy flow and entropy production in resonance scattering* submitted to Proc. Solvay conference in Delphi, Greece.
- [15] Wigner, E.P. (1952). *Rev.Mod.Phys.* 29, 255.
- [16] Salecker, H. and Wigner, E.P. (1958). *Phys.Rev.* 109, pp.571-577.
- [17] Zimmerson, E.J. (1962). *Am.J.Phys* 30, 97.
- [18] Karimov, A.R. (2008). *Statistical Model of Discrete-continual time*, to appear in *New Advances in Physics*.
- [19] Halliwell, J. (1991). *Scientific American* December 1991.
- [20] Adrian Cho (2004). *Phys.Rev.* September 28, 2004. Also <http://focus.aps.org/story/v14/st13>.
- [21] Ambjorn, J, Gorlich, A., Jurkiewicz, J and Loll, R. (2008). *Phys.Rev.Lett.* Vol.100, Article No. 091304; March 7, 2008. Preprint at arxiv.org/abs/0712.2485.

- [22] Loll, R. (2008). *Classical and Quantum Gravity* Vol.25, No.11, Article No.114006; June 7, 2008. arxiv.org/abs/0711.0273.
- [23] Smolin, L. (2005). *The Trouble with Physics* (Basic Books, New York).
- [24] Sidharth, B.G. (2008). *The Thermodynamic Universe* (World Scientific, Singapore).
- [25] Sidharth, B.G. *The Limits of Special Relativity* to appear in *Foundations of Physics*.
- [26] Sidharth, B.G. *Revisiting Zitterbewegung* arXiv:0806.0985.
- [27] Weinberg, S. (1972). *Gravitation and Cosmology* (John Wiley & Sons, New York), p.61ff.
- [28] Smolin, L. (1986). *Quantum Concepts in Space and Time*, Penrose, R. and Isham, C.J. (eds.) (OUP, Oxford), pp.147–181.
- [29] Reif, F. (1965). *Fundamentals of Statistical and Thermal Physics* (McGraw-Hill Book Co., Singapore).
- [30] Sidharth, B.G. (2000). *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals* (12), (1), pp.173–178.
- [31] Nottale, L. (1993). *Fractal Space-Time and Microphysics: Towards a Theory of Scale Relativity* (World Scientific, Singapore), pp.312.
- [32] Sidharth, B.G. (2001). *Chaotic Universe: From the Planck to the Hubble Scale* (Nova Science, New York).
- [33] Sachs, M. (1982). *General Relativity and Matter* (D. Reidel Publishing Company, Holland), pp.45ff.
- [34] Sidharth, B.G. (2003) *Found.Phys.Lett.* 16, (1), pp.91–97.
- [35] Shirokov, Yu. M. (1958). *Soviet Physics JETP* 6, (33), No.5, pp.929–935.
- [36] Schiff, L.I. (1968). *Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw Hill, London).
- [37] Sidharth, B.G. (1998). *Int.J.Mod.Phys.A* 13 (15), p.2599ff.

- [38] Sidharth, B.G. (2005). *The Universe of Fluctuations* (Springer, Netherlands).
- [39] Aiello, M., Castagnino, M. and Lombardi, O. (2008). *Found.Phys* 38, pp.257-292.
- [40] Roman, P. (1965). *Advanced Quantum Theory* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.), p.31.
- [41] Prigogine, I. (1985). *Order Out of Chaos* (Flamingo, Harper Collins, London), pp.xix.